

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,530	05/15/2001	Reto Sieber	F 6817 5031	
75	590 07/09/2003			
Jordan and Hamburg			EXAMINER	
122 East 42nd S New York, NY			AHMAD, NASSER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	18
			DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A-5-19.
	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/762,530	SIEBER ET AL.	
, 	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nasser Ahmad	1772	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			
THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a viral rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applicati	to a on in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi fimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the appropunt of the fee. The approportionally set in the final O	n. See MPEP priate extension priate extension office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 19-31.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examin	er.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	.	
10. ☐ Other:			
		Nasser Ahmad Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1772	€

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's position that "cover" by definition "covers the entire surface" is not supported and could not be located in the instant claims. Further, contrary to applicant's allegation, Marchal's adhesive does exhibit different adhesive strength as recited in the abstract. It is also submitted that the instant claims does not preclude the presence of perforated layer as taught in Marchal. Also, the conditions of how the adhesive is coated is directed to the process of forming the product and is not germae to the issue of patentability of the product itself.